

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. By this response, applicants amend claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19 and cancel claim 10. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 11-20 are presented to the Examiner for consideration.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Burnett *et al.* Burnett *et al.* describe an apparatus for controlling a network control center by providing the system with network infrastructure information. The apparatus is a remote sensor which acquires information and merely monitors the network. In contrast, the bee monitoring system of the subject invention, acquires or collects data, processes that data, then controls and actuates remote devices. The bee monitoring system of the subject invention has input transducers to collect data, a microprocessor to process that data and output signals which actuate and control remote devices. Burnett *et al.* do not describe such a device. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection based on this reference.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Burnett *et al.* in view of Bowden. Bowden describes an electronic tide table. The device of Bowden uses a RABBIT™ microprocessor. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to employ the RABBIT™ microprocessor of Bowden in the system of Burnett *et al.* to facilitate the analysis of multiple streams of incoming data. The device of Burnett *et al.* acquires and reports data. The microprocessor of Bowden uses acquired data to predict tidal times. Neither of these references, alone or in combination, suggest or describe a device that acquires data, processes that data, and then, based on that processed data, is able to control remote devices. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 15 and 19 claim that, in a preferred embodiment, the microprocessor of the bee counter of the subject bee monitoring system comprises the programming shown in FIG. 3. Claims 15 and 19 have been rewritten to recite the specific steps of the program shown in FIG. 3. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

10

Docket No. UMT-102XC1
Serial No. 10/631,175

Claims 11, 14 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for stating the subject bee monitoring system comprises a RABBIT™ microprocessor. The claims have been amended to recite the desired generic properties of that microprocessor. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 12 and 13 have been objected to for being dependent upon a rejected claim 1. Applicants submit that the cited references do not suggest or describe the subject bee monitoring system that acquires and processes data, and controls remote devices. Claim 1 has been amended and clearly describes such a device. Therefore applicants believe claim 12 and 13 depend from a claim that is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

It was indicated that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to address §112, second paragraph issues. The claim has been amended to address these issues and depends from what the applicants believe is a claim in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this claim is respectfully requested.

The Examiner had indicated that claim 18 would be allowable is rewritten to overcome the §112, second paragraph rejection. Claim 18 has been so amended and applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner kindly identifying typographical and formal errors in the application. Claim 12 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Further, the specification, including the abstract, has been amended to address typographical and formal errors.


11

Docket No. UMT-102XC1
Serial No. 10/631,175

In view of the foregoing remarks and the amendments to the claims, applicants believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any of this response, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,



Jean Kyle
Patent Attorney
Registration No. 36,987
Phone No.: (406) 375-1317
Address : P.O. Box 2274
Hamilton, MT 59840-4274